REPORT RESUMES

ED 015 977 UD 004 716

TECHNIQUES FOR ACHIEVING RACIALLY DESEGREGATED, SUPERIOR QUALITY EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS.

BY- WEINBERG, MEYER

PUB DATE NOV 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$2.00 48P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL INTEGRATION, *EDUCATIONAL QUALITY, *INTEGRATION METHODS, TRANSFER POLICY, SCHOOL REDISTRICTING, SCHOOL ZONING, SCHOOL LOCATION, VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOLS, BIRACIAL SCHOOLS, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, PRINCIPALS, TEACHING ASSIGNMENT, TEACHER DISTRIBUTION, PARENT PARTICIPATION, INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, NEGROES, CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

THIS PAPER OUTLINES 12 TECHNIQUES FOR INTEGRATING THE SCHOOLS IN CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, OVER A 2-YEAR PERIOD. FIRST, TO USE SCHOOL SPACE MORE EQUITABLY, THERE SHOULD BE MANDATORY TRANSFER ASSIGNMENTS FOR BETTER RACIAL BALANCE, AND TRANSPORTATION SHOULD BE PAID FOR BY THE SCHOOL BOARD. SUCH A TRANSFER PLAN WOULD RELIEVE OVERCROWDING AND UNDERUTILIZATION AND IMPROVE THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES OF NEGRO STUDENTS. REDISTRICTING AND PAIRINGS ARE CONSIDERED TRANSITIONAL STEPS WHICH WOULD ELIMINATE ABOUT 35 PERCENT OF ALL SEGREGATED SCHOOLS, BUT THEY MUST BE ACCOMPANIED BY SHIFTING ALREADY PLANNED NEW SCHOOLS TO SITES OFFERING BETTER POSSIBILITIES FOR INTEGRATION. THREE PREDOMINANTLY ALL-NEGRO VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS SHOULD BE CLOSED, WITH STUDENTS REASSIGNED TO GENERAL HIGH SCHOOLS, AND TWO OTHERS SHOULD BE CONVERTED INTO TRADE SCHOOLS. THE APPRENTICESHIP PROGRAM AT WASHBURN HIGH SCHOOL SHOULD EITHER BECOME NONDISCRIMINATORY OR BE ELIMINATED. THE EXISTING 89 INTEGRATED SCHOOLS SHOULD BECOME A MODEL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT. EXPERIENCED PRINCIPALS SHOULD BE PLACED IN THE "MOST DIFFICULT" SCHOOLS AND NEGRO PRINCIPALS ASSIGNED TO WHITE SCHOOLS. ALL SCHOOLS MUST HAVE THE FULL ALLOTMENT OF TENURED TEACHERS. FEDERAL FUNDS SHOULD BE USED TO CUT CLASS SIZE, HIRE TEACHER AIDES, AND PLAN COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS. THERE SHOULD ALSO BE PARENT PARTICIPATION, WITH GRIEVANCE PROCEDURES WORKED OUT FOR DISPUTES. THIS PAPER WAS PREPARED FOR THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY IN AMERICA'S CITIES, SPONSORED BY THE U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS, WASHINGTON, D.C., NOVEMBER 16-18, 1967. (NH)

04716

ED015977

UD 004 716

TECHNIQUES FOR ACHIEVING RACIALLY DESEGREGATED, SUPERIOR QUALITY EDUCATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Prepared by
Meyer Weinberg, Editor, Integrated Education
for the
National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity
sponsored by the
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D.C.
November 16-18, 1967

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INTRODUCTION

The day of the pure-and-simple desegregation plan has passed on. Those who would induce educational change must nowadays move along a much broader front. The classical model still holds in part: specific boundaries and children need to be moved promptly in accordance with a timetable.

But two other lines of endeavor now are required. First, considerable attention must be given to classroom instruction, school organization, and administrative relationships. To by-pass these is to assume that racism never affected the day-to-day operations of school systems. That courts are finding it increasingly necessary to enter this area reflects the realism of the judges.[1] Second, attention also must be given to the role of organized parents in the governance of public schools. Integrationists should not lament the momentary identification of parent control and racially separatist sentiments. This will change as parents discover the impossibility of financing an adequate public school system without the support of the larger community.

To many the prospect of school integration is literally unthinkable; to others, the prospect is so distant as to seem impossible. As a result, few have thought much about the actual shape of school integration, or concrete transitional steps to full integration. We shall deal in this paper with the second of these points.

A growing consensus among students of the problem points in the direction of large-scale school organization in order to realize certain advantages of instruction, ethnic relations, economy, and broader urban development. Education parks especially have been the subject of much discussion. Whatever the precise form the school system of the future takes, it will have to include several elements:

1. Large-scale organization to permit far more specialization and individualization of instruction.
2. A student body drawn from very large areas and thus likely to include many children of diverse ethnic and economic backgrounds.
3. Large enough size to permit centralization of exceptionally expensive services and installations, ordinarily either wasted or beyond the financial capability of single neighborhood schools.

4. Such educational centers would be best integrated into a commercial and cultural center for the entire area of 250,000 or more persons.

Because public education is increasingly urban education, the trend toward large-scale organization has a broad base. It is difficult to imagine how the individual needs and talents of millions of children can be taken into account other than through the differentiation and specialization afforded by large-scale organization.

What changes might be made in Chicago's schools within the next two years that could produce measurable and meaningful progress toward such superior, desegregated education? There are, of course, external limits: financial, legal, organizational. As far as we are aware, every proposal made here is practicable in the sense that extraordinary expenditures are not immediately required. Their implementation violates no law, nor unnecessarily burdens the capacities of the school administration.

Our proposals are first steps in two senses. They are initial strides toward the desirable goal of equal education opportunity; they are designed to prepare the way for second and third steps. They aim not at solving everything at once but at involving everyone in a common enterprise. Under these proposals every part of the city would be working on some significant aspect of an overall program for superior desegregated education. Meanwhile, work on the longer-range program would have to proceed.

The most frequently listed desegregation devices are:

1. Open enrollment
2. Two-way busing
3. Redistricting
4. Paired schools (Princeton Plan)
5. One grade school
6. Narrow grade spans
7. Children's Academy
8. Feeder patterns
9. Site selection
10. School closing
11. Education parks

Each of these devices has at least one variant and some a number of them. Abstractly considered, it might well be possible to desegregate Chicago in short order by a thorough combination of all or some of the devices. Certainly, specialists possess enough technical knowledge to do so.

Here, however, we are concerned to stress that point to a more complete desegregation. We are not concerned with panaceas. No less, however, are we concerned with excuses for inaction.

Popular debate on the general social issue has assumed a disjunction between integration and education. The former is usually taken to refer to moving "bodies", the latter, to instructing them. We hold rather that equal educational opportunity requires the creative, planned cooperation of children who are supplied with the best facilities and help our resources can command. The proof is in the pudding; when Negro and white youngsters of all classes are customarily able to achieve near their potentials, we will be able to speak of integrated education which is necessarily superior. Providing every child with an equally poor education is not equality, and even if they are all sitting next to each other it is not integration. Certainly, this would be an opportunity for nothing but disaster.

Today, we cannot speak meaningfully of desegregation without also dealing with classroom instruction and school organization. As recently as five years ago, desegregation plans were almost exclusively a matter of shifting students and boundary lines. (Very little of each was, in fact, done.) A measure of our progress is the fact that desegregation plans are becoming more pedagogic. The new desegregation plan will not so readily disjoin integration and education; it will insist on the realization of greater educational opportunity. This cannot be done without attending to the classroom, the school, and the system.*

THE TECHNIQUES

Equitable Use of School Space

The equitable use of school space as a desegregation device depends upon:

(1) the availability of classroom space on a differential racial basis;

(2) preparation of parents, teachers, and children in the receiving and sending schools; and

(3) the availability of free transportation.

---

* In the several weeks' time while this paper was being prepared, three courts rendered decisions in northern school segregation bases. In the Chester case, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court reversed two lower courts and ruled that a state administrative agency could order a school board to end racial imbalance even if no statute explicitly granted the agency that power. In Kokomo, Indiana, a federal district court directed the school board not to build a projected school in the midst of a Negro neighborhood. In South Bend, a federal district court entered a similar order in addition to which the board agreed to restudy the state of racial balance throughout the school district. All three decisions would have been precedent-shattering ten years ago. Who can tell what precedents will be shattered ten years hence? A very strong tendency evidently is setting in whereby courts will pay much more heed to the issue of inequalities in academic achievement, teacher supply, instructional equipment and supplies, and other factors. In any event, the realism of any program for northern desegregation should be viewed from within a supple legal framework.

Mandatory assignment under this technique should be regarded as a way for Chicago's school system to partly redress the racial inequality of resources it has made available to children. This is why the school board must pay the costs of implementation. A significant number of schools could be desegregated by this mechanism.

In 1966, the school board announced a transfer plan for elementary schools. Children in 51 sending schools, primarily Negro, could attend any of 89 receiving schools, primarily white, provided that the average class size in the latter was 30 or more and the class size in the former was 35. A total of 7,787 seats were available in receiving schools. Only 3,011 students in crowded schools, however, were declared eligible to transfer. Only 164 actually did transfer; neither transportation nor lunches were provided by the school board.

If all 7,787 seats had been filled by transferees, average class size in the receiving schools still would have been below the citywide average. An average of about 85 students per receiving school would have transferred, an easily manageable number. The receiving schools were small, on the whole enrolling less than 800 per school. As important, a number of sending schools would have been relieved of the heavy burden of overcrowded classes.

The probable desegregation effect of equitable use of school space, and transfers to be maximized in the direction of integration, has been estimated by Dr. Faith Rich:

> Twelve of the 89 receiving schools already were racially mixed. Theoretically, if transfers were allowed only in the direction of racial integration, 37 white schools (17% of 122 such schools) would be desegregated, as would 4, or 11% of the white branch schools. Only two Negro schools out of the total 171 (i.e., 1%), and one of the 18 Negro branch schools (i.e., 8%) would be desegregated.[3]

Almost certainly, such desegregation would also result in nearly 8,000 children gaining more adequate places to learn.

Assigning students to underutilized facilities in Chicago would have the effect of making highly experienced teachers available to children who otherwise would not have them. This would seem to be an excellent way of reducing teacher mobility while increasing academic achievement and economic efficiency.

Fortunately, the principle of mandatory assignment of students for desegregation has recently been approved by the school board.[4]

Redistricting

Redistricting can make a distinct contribution to desegregating Chicago's schools. Given practical obstacles such as extreme distances and the configuration of residential patterns, school segregation cannot be eradicated by redistricting. Nevertheless, it is an indispensable technique in a transition period such as the present.

In 1963 Berry stated that "the Chicago board of education could wipe out segregation in as many as 75 all-white or all-Negro schools simply by redistricting".[5] This is about one-fourth of the all-Negro or all-white schools. In 1964, Hauser pointed to facts favoring the feasibility of some redistricting: "Six of the eight all-Negro high schools are within one mile of white residences, and there are six white high schools and three white high school branches within one mile of the Negro residential area".[6] The U.S. Office of Education, (in its January, 1967, report on Chicago) dealt with the problem of attendance area boundaries, and called upon the school board to adopt a plan "to lessen segregated education and, indeed, to reverse trends of increasing segregation where possible".[7] In August, 1967, Coons stated that redistricting was feasible on the fringes of the ghetto; he listed it as a short-term measure.[8]

Pairing, a special form of redistricting, was observed by Hauser in 1964 to be operating in at least one instance.[9] Coons, in 1967, held that pairing "offers modest possibilities for useful change ...it is possible to consider in Chicago the pairing of a number of schools in key transition areas ..."[10] This was regarded by Coons as a short-term possibility. Katz suggested that pairing be interracial but homogeneous as to social class.[11]

Site selection should be governed by the proposition laid down by Coons: "...No further educational building in Negro segregated areas should be undertaken except when space is unavailable on an integrated basis".[12] Current application of this principle would preclude existing plans for building two new high schools eleven blocks apart. One would be integrated, the other Negro-segregated. Some $8 million have been appropriated. Several integrative sites are available. It should be noted, also, that the planned Negro-segregated school -- Forrestville -- is to be built for a capacity of 2,000. The old building contained 1,950 students in September 1967. Were a new building actually built and completed by 1969 or 1970, it would not only be open segregated, but extremely crowded. In another case, a $1 million addition is scheduled to be built onto Bowen High School - a 75-year old structure -- in an effort to keep the school predominantly white. Meanwhile, a fifteen-minute ride away, is a gigantic empty tract of land owned by the city; it is at the center of a circle of Negro and white segregated schools. Building a large installation here would almost certainly favor stable integration, and it would be much more defensible educationally.

Pairing

The school board should institute a series of pairings of adjacent schools of different racial composition. Such schools should be granted extra resources and significantly lower class size.

Pairing is a means of making an enlarged attendance area out of two nearby schools; children of both races in the first four grades are then assigned to one of the schools; the children in grades 5-8 are assigned to the other. Desegregation is bound to follow inasmuch as the two schools are attended by substantially the same students who attended what were segregated schools.

Pairing* has been tried under four extremely different conditions -- in New York City, small towns in Kentucky, Greenburgh, New York, and Coatesville, Pennsylvania.[13]

During 1964-1966, eight schools in New York were grouped into four pairs. During the first year, a much more balanced ethnic composition was attained in each school. Despite much alarmist discussion, there was no wholesale departure of whites. An evaluation during the second year noted that "the favorable balance is being maintained".[14] As for academic achievement, the evaluation found: "..Pupils in all schools demonstrated an improved standing in relation to national norms at the end of the experimental period. Very frequently the improvement attained exceeded the expected gains based upon national norms".[15]

---

* For a fuller discussion, see Appendix A, at end.

Pairing in Chicago is made more practicable by the record of stable integration at points along the edge of the Negro ghetto for some years now. White parents do not automatically withdraw their children from schools attended by an appreciable number of Negro children. Transition schools aside, fully two-thirds of all children in bi-racial schools have remained in a stable ethnic relationship over the past four annual ethnic censuses. It would seem prudent to base school policy on this fact.

In August, 1967, Professor Coons held that while pairing "offers modest possibilities for useful change ... it is possible to consider in Chicago the pairing of a number of schools in key transition areas ...."[16] It should be emphasized that pairing in transition areas should involve segregated rather than already desegregated schools; more precisely, pairing applies especially to Negro segregated schools bordered by white schools.

Some 25 possible pairs may be counted. In two cases of white upper grade centers, Chopin and Cooper on the west side, a change in feeder patterns may be more appropriate than pairing.

Pairings might desegregate over 10% of the 440 elementary schools and their 57 branches. Some of the mobiles might be used to equalize capacities or to improve the quality and increase the variety of facilities.

Vocational High Schools

It is officially acknowledged that Negroes comprise two-thirds of the enrollment of the city's vocational high schools; they make up only two-fifths of the enrollment in the general high schools. At the same time, investigators have criticized severely the quality of some of the wholly Negro vocational schools. In 1964 Havighurst recommended that "Cooley and Westcott Vocational High Schools, because of their inadequacy as schools for high school youth, should be transformed into Adult Education Centers..."[18] Regarding school achievement scores on standard tests, Coons wrote in 1965 that "Cregier Vocational could readily qualify as a disaster area";[19] he referred to "the dismal report on vocational schools as academic institutions with the sole exception of Chicago Vocational".[20] Together, in 1966, Cooley, Westcott (now Simeon), and Cregier enrolled a total of 2,767 students. Thus, nearly one-third of all Negro students in vocational schools attend schools whose standards are notoriously inferior. In the Cooley neighborhood, in September 1967, parents were demanding that Cooley Vocational be closed because of its inadequacy. Study of the Cooley attendance area map shows readily that the student body is perhaps more segregated within a narrower geographical area than any other city school of like circumstance.[21]

The school board should prepare to close out Cooley and Simeon Vocational High Schools by June, 1968, and consider closing Cregier at the same time. Most of these students should be assigned to general high schools. Wells General High School, for example, is less than two miles away from Cooley and easily accessible on public transportation.

At the same time, a more fundamental change should be instituted. Dunbar (99.8% Negro) and Prosser (98.9% white) should be converted from vocational high schools into full-scale trade schools. The most popular trades could be divided between Dunbar and Prosser; the most segregated trades should be offered at Dunbar. As has been officially acknowledged, there is grave reason to doubt the specific employment-contribution of the present vocational schools.[22] Trade schools, on the other hand, have an outstanding record in Chicago. During the 1940's and part of the 1950's, Dunbar Trade School was a valued institution which helped many Negro youths enter productive employment.[23]

The school board should make immediate application for a federal grant to set up a residential vocational education school, under Section 14 of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. For some reason, the Chicago board of education has failed for three years to apply for these available funds. This grant is available to serve youths between the ages of 15 and 21 and is directed at "the needs of large urban areas having substantial numbers of youths who have dropped out of school or are unemployed..."[24] The grant covers construction costs as well as equipment and operational costs. Such residential units are imaginative responses to a deep need in Chicago. Some educational authorities have written about the possible usefulness of residential units, within a public school setting, for younger children whose home conditions are irretrievably difficult. Experience with the residential vocational units might give the school system valuable experience as a basis for judgment on the residential technique in general.

Appropriations for the Vocational Education Act of 1963 will expire after the present fiscal year. Fortunately, however, Representative Roman C. Pucinski has introduced legislation to extend the life of the law (H. R. 8525) which includes a $10 million provision for residential vocational schools. Hearings have been held on the bill and it is about to be brought to the floor of the House of Representatives.[25]

Katz has suggested that work-study programs be decentralized so that individual schools might make agreements with local employers.[26] Numerous shops and offices are still to be found throughout the city. The large printing plants of Donnelly, for example, dominate a good part of the landscape of the Near South Side. At 63rd and Halsted, numerous earning and learning opportunities are present in the stores and offices. The schools in Englewood should negotiate directly on these matters.

Some of the least effective Negro vocational schools, we have suggested, should be closed. One of the more effective, Dunbar, should be transformed into a trade school. Most of the remaining vocational schools are either segregated or ineffective or both. The racial character of each of these schools could be rather easily changed. This would require that attendance areas be drawn for each one and that the area boundaries include a wide variety of children. Because of the small number of schools involved, attendance areas will necessarily be large. Some such measure is needed to make the schools racially representative. The alternative approach, to try once more to make the city-wide vocational open-enrollment policy effective,[27] depends too much on factors that remain unchanged. As Havighurst noted about Prosser (white): "There appears to be a pattern of exclusion of Negroes from Prosser".[28] This was true despite a formal policy of open enrollment.

Washburne

The proposals regarding Washburne, made by the U.S. Office of Education in January, 1967, should be adopted in form and content. They include the following:[29]

1. "A statement by the board to the joint apprenticeship councils with trades represented in the Chicago public schools that the present number of Negroes admitted to apprenticeship programs is no more than a first step in creating opportunity in these programs."
2. "A qualified and objective observer should attend all council activities which are relevant to the indenturing process."
3. Incorporate the findings of the U.S. Department of Labor review of the Washburne apprenticeship program.
4. Have the school board, the Office of Education, and the Department of Labor conclude an agreement "to carry out the /‾Mayor's apprenticeship_/ program /‾of 1965_/ more effectively". This agreement is to include a timetable for the various steps agreed upon.

   If a union fails to change its discriminatory policy, the board should invoke its resolution of July 14, 1965, and exclude the offending union and employer.
5. Draw up a long-term program to help minority youth to: "(a) know about apprenticeship opportunities, and (b) qualify for them".

Should it become evident that a number of unions and employers prefer to suffer exclusion from Washburne rather than alter their racially discriminatory policies, the entire facility might be converted at minimal cost -- federally financed -- into Chicago's first residential vocational educational school.

INTEGRATING THE BI-RACIAL SCHOOL

In October, 1966, over 86,000 Negro and white students attended 89 schools formally integrated, i.e., the enrollment of each school was between 10% and 90% Negro.[30] Two-thirds of this number was enrolled in stable-integrated schools; the remainder in transition schools - schools apparently changing from predominantly white to predominantly Negro.

These 86,000 students can be viewed fruitfully as equivalent in size to many medium-sized school systems. (The entire public school enrollment of Rochester and Syracuse combined is only 75,000.) In a real sense, then, the 86,000 constitute a desegregated school system. These students should be viewed as a special opportunity and challenge by the school system. Here they are; they need not be bused; they need not be redistricted for purposes of racial balance; no political opposition need be brooked in order to bring them together. They are together.

But are they, really? Do learning and teaching occur in the light of the ethnic balance that is present in these schools? Could Negro and white students as well be in racially separate schools? In other words, has the desegregation led to any educational consequences?

A school already desegregated must move rapidly toward integration. Otherwise, the interracial aspect of enrollment will come to be viewed as essentially irrelevant to the educational task of the school. Worse, if at the same time the equality of education in such schools is allowed to decline, desegregation will be viewed as a positive harm to the educational task of the school. Since nothing but certain physical factors will have changed, the supporters of desegregation will leave themselves open to criticism as mere ideologists of physical "mixing". Desegregation is the breaking down of institutional barriers to equal educational opportunity. Integration is the realization of these opportunities.

A desegregated school moving toward integration might evidence some or all of the following behavior:

1. New instructional materials are found and used which portray more truthfully the role of ethnic minorities and majorities in American life and history.
2. The curriculum is being explored and revised to become more relevant to the troubled contemporary social reality in the world and at home.
3. A sense of fellowship and mutual respect is engendered by deliberate staff and student planning.
4. Extra-curricular activities are suffused with a democratic, anti-exclusivist temper.
5. Counseling and guidance functions are performed without distortion of race or color.
6. Special measures are taken to avoid academic stereotyping, and thus avoidance of individual needs, by rigid adherence to track systems.
7. A close, collaborative relationship is constructed between school and community, based on full disclosures

of problems and candid discussion of remedies.

8. Teachers are given conditions and authority that enable them to work confidently and flexibly with students of differing capacities and preparations.

9. Principals are aware of the special challenge of a desegregated student body and demonstrate a sympathetic appreciation of the need for academic accomplishment.

We propose that the school board designate all desegregated schools as part of an administrative area under the provisions of the administrative reorganization now under way. An area associate superintendent would be assigned with directions to coordinate activities designed to move from desegregation to integration.

The teachers' union has a contractual obligation to help select textbooks, and to work in other activities of a desegregative and integrative character. It can be expected to work especially closely with the area superintendent on these matters.

The 89 schools could become the testing-ground for experimental use of selected textbooks, films, and other instructional materials that recently have been produced in profusion, perhaps even confusion. To carry out such a function, the area superintendent would need authority to omit or modify customary procedures whereby new instructional materials are adopted. New printed materials could originate in the area's schools, prepared by teachers supplied with technical aid.

The promise and problems of urban life would necessarily occupy a central position in the curriculum of the area's schools.

Close, first-hand examination of the urban community would require extensive educational excursions, coordinated with a more systematic effort to afford students a knowledge of urban economy, careers, politics and government, and mass communications.

In these schools especially, students would learn the reality of planning cooperatively. The making by students of school-wide decisions on educational practice and, where possible, policy, would take on added significance in an interracial context. For Chicago this may be the most valuable of all the lessons an integrated school can teach.

An area-wide parent council could exemplify the same lesson. A number of the parent groups at presently desegregated schools already are vigorous proponents of better education, including good human relations. The ethnic and social variety of parents in the area would help ensure that vigor. The recent proliferation of Concerned Parents Groups is sufficient warrant of a widespread dedication to quality education.

The integrated school must be, above all, a place in which teaching and learning dominate the proceedings. Teachers unaccustomed to plan their own distinctive contributions must be encouraged -- more by structural change than by imprecation and exhortation -- to search out more effective procedures and approaches. Next to the abilities of the students, the second greatest untapped resource of the school system is the capacity of teachers to improve the schools. Enlisting teacher participation would seem also to have strategic value: Teacher insecurity is bound to increase in the context of the numerous organizational and curricular changes that are impending. The most constructive way to minimize the insecurity is to give teachers a professional voice in guiding the changes.

The long-run importance of integrating the desegregated school can hardly be exaggerated. As Thoreau wrote long ago; "If you would convince a man that he does wrong, do right. But do not care to convince him. -- Men will believe what they see. Let them see".[31]

THE SCHOOL'S STAFF

The Pivotal Role of the Principal

The principal can be the pivot of a good school or the millstone of a poor one. Achievement of superior desegregated education requires the most carefully planned placement of principals. Yet, in Chicago, experienced principals are, for the most part, assigned to the "easier" schools, while many large schools in the ghetto are administered by inexperienced principals. The inexperienced principal cannot grasp the elements that go into a good school. He is easily upset when faced with emergencies; he does not inspire the confidence of teachers, who thus become all the less attached to the school; he does not know how to get things done; he fails to work confidently and cooperatively with the community; and, all in all, does not readily understand the distinctive needs of the children in his school.

The school board should adopt a policy of mandatory assignment of principals in accordance with educational need of the system. Experience should be the first criterion; special training and a record of success should be considered. But the most valuable principals should be assigned to the neediest schools. These schools could be ranked, for example, on the basis of academic achievement; the lowest-ranking deserve the greatest help.

A low-achieving school is in desperate need of educational leadership. A recent study conducted in Chicago schools showed that "the most important factor in holding teachers in difficult schools is the principal".[32] It would seem logical, therefore, to ensure first a supply of principals where they are most needed.

In fact, it happens to be easier to do this for principals than for teachers. Principals are part of the administration, and thus do not constitute a separate legal bargaining unit. The board has complete authority to assign principals in the interest of the school system as a whole. At present, this authority is unchallenged by principals even in cases where they are reassigned at a reduction in salary.

Principals are much less likely to rebel in the face of a reassignment because of at least four reasons: (a) They have a greater financial stake in their position than do teachers; (b) the alternative to continuing as a principal is to return to the classroom, a fate commonly viewed as akin to banishment; (c) there is no shortage of aspirants to their jobs; and (d) designation would close off any future promotion from the principalship.

Such mandatory assignment of principals might have a major effect on the recruitment of experienced teachers for ghetto schools. Rightly or not, critics of learning conditions in these schools often point to the shortage of experienced teachers as a prime cause of the poor learning conditions in ghetto schools. Teachers contend, with much justification, that merely adding experienced teachers to an impossible situation will not relieve the root causes of poor learning.[33] They call upon the school administration for drastically smaller class size, much larger budgets, and the like. Perhaps teachers would be less unwilling to transfer if they saw the administration assigning "its own" in accordance with need.

Clearly, to continue belaboring the teacher alone is to court deep resistance. We cannot, after all, be in much of an emergency if the educational leaders of the system are left almost entirely to their own devices while the rank and file are urged to respond to the appeals of high professionalism.

The Faculty

The problems of distribution of teachers must be approached along with the matter of principals. (See above, pp. 20-22.) One, however, cannot be a substitute for the other. The educational task of the school requires adequate principals and teachers.

The U. S. Office of Education, in January, 1967, called upon the school board "to spread the range of talents, age, experience, training, and specialization among its different schools".[34] Especially noted was the need to "increase the proportion of experienced teachers in disadvantaged schools".

It would be helpful if we keep clear the various classifications of teachers in the system.

1. Regularly assigned, tenured teachers. Teachers who passed written and oral examinations were awarded a regular certificate in a subject or grade, and have served at least three years after receiving the certificate.
2. Regularly assigned, non-tenured teachers. Same as above but who have not yet completed three years of teaching after receiving the certificate.

3. Full-time Basis Substitutes (F.T.B.'s) Substitute teachers who have not passed an examination for a regular certificate. Assigned to fill temporarily vacant posts, usually for a semester. Many have taught a number of years.

4. Day-to-Day Substitutes.

The white-privileged schools in the system depend almost entirely upon teachers in classes 1 and 2 with extremely few in 3 and 4. The Negro-deprived schools have extremely few class 1 teachers, many class 2, and a large number of class 3 and 4 teachers. The most glaring inequality is the small proportion of class 1 teachers in the disadvantaged schools; another is the abundance of less experienced and less trained teachers.

The board should initially ascertain the actual distribution of class 1, 2, and 3 teachers in the system as a whole and school by school. The first goal shall be to attain a proportionate distribution of all regularly assigned tenured teachers. By February, 1968, each principal should be notified as to his assignment or re-assignment for September, 1968. He should be informed of the distribution of regularly assigned teachers on his new faculty and be directed to recruit the required number from among teachers inside and outside the system. If principals do not attain their quotas, the superintendent should assign teachers following seniority.

One of three teachers is Negro, but only one of twenty principals;[35] none of the latter is assigned to a non-Negro school. Negro teachers who wish to transfer to a white school are thus all but certain to have a white principal. Whatever the abstract merits of the case, suspicion is widespread that Negro teachers who evince a wish to transfer to white schools are subject to retaliation by white principals. Assignment of more Negro principals to white schools could very likely attract more Negro teachers by allaying their fears. Such assignment also would force a change in the reputation of schools as either white or Negro. Needless to say, it would be enormously educative for white students and teachers.

Priority should go to increasing the supply of highly experienced teachers in the Negro-segregated schools. Increasing the flow of Negro teachers to white schools should be a second priority.

IMPROVING INSTRUCTION NOW

Quality instruction in an integrated setting has yielded the greatest success yet known in academic achievement of average Negro children. Long-term solutions such as a system of educational parks will result in extensive arrangements for fully individualizing instruction. Meanwhile, we must institute changes that point in that direction. Most valued are proposals which will benefit the average student rather than the specially gifted child.

Certain significant changes can be made almost immediately. Some are matters of housekeeping, some of program, and others of organization.

In December, 1965, the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations (CCCO) proposed a Title I program for Chicago.[36] Essentially, it suggested all Title I funds ($30 million for 1965-66) be used to create some quality education in the 100 most seriously deprived elementary schools, enrolling some 85,000 students. The central proposal was to cut class size in half. It was stated that this could be done by placing two teachers in each classroom and/or by renting enough mobiles to accommodate the surplus students; the mobiles were to be located as to maximize integration. C.C.C.O. held that sufficient classroom personnel could be recruited from among regular teachers attracted by small class size, retired teachers, seniors in teachers' colleges, and others. Teacher aides, it was suggested, could be employed extensively. The CCCO program was not accepted. (Since neither the 1965-66 nor the 1966-67 Title I programs were evaluated, it is not possible to measure the success or failure of the school board programs.) 37

There is a certain educational naiveté in a program involving one central change -- small class size. On the other hand, very likely no comparable group had ever been taught with such small class size. Even the More Effective Schools program in New York City, which involves only some 16,000 students, enjoys a class size of 20.1 students per teacher. The Chicago class size would have been between 15 and 18. Except for the students who would have been in integrated mobiles, more than half the students would have remained in a segregated setting.

We can no longer have neither integration nor compensatory education. Lacking immediate desegregation of the ghetto with its built-in inequities, palpable and significant innovations must be introduced into the most deprived schools. The CCCO proposal should be reinstated and re-evaluated.

Upwards of one-fourth of a teacher's working day is occupied with the performance of non-teaching duties. These duties rarely require any advanced training but are primarily clerical. In a school of 40 teachers (a moderately large school but average-size in the ghetto), the equivalent of 10 teachers is used up every day merely in filling out forms and wiping noses, so to speak. Such wastage of teachers would be merely mindless under conditions of plenty; but what should we think of it in schools faced with more than enough challenges and too few teachers? In a real sense, the quickest way to obtain ten new teachers is by hiring forty new aides.

In these schools, large numbers of aides would seem obligatory. Surely, one aide for each teacher would not seem excessive. Extensive experience already has been accumulated on the training and use of subprofessional aides.[38] Formal schooling would seem to be relatively unimportant prerequisite for many of these positions.

PARENTS AND GOVERNANCE OF THE SCHOOLS

Academic achievement of a number of schools is sharply below acceptable norms. These schools must be adjudged failures. Responsibility for the failure must be lodged with the public body in authority. But it is responsibility without response. Nothing happens in the system to change the number of failures; indeed, the number rises. And so do school budgets. It is as though bankruptcy were rewarded with large gifts.

In Illinois the legislature is enjoined by the state constitution to afford every child "a good common school education". (Illinois Constitution, Art. VIII, Sec. 1). Widespread default by school boards has not brought forth even a legislative inquiry, let alone a remedy. It is difficult to speak of superior, desegregated education in such a context.

Two steps are possible. First, parents whose children are assigned to schools persistently producing failures could insist on a direct voice in local school affairs. Parents are not, of course, necessarily better educators than are school board members. On the other hand, if the gas inspector refuses to plug leaks, then people are justified -- indeed obliged -- to take hold of the wrenches themselves.

Second, public education should become in law a governmentally-operated public utility. As such, the state would be obliged to maintain meaningful standards and to relate charges to quality of service. Education in the modern world is a fundamental necessity of life. It should no longer be treated as a luxury which some can afford and others not.

The Chicago school board should share its authority with parents of children in failing schools, and lead a legislative effort to make the schools a public utility.

Parent participation can help make the curriculum more relevant to urban life. And it must extend beyond momentary emergencies. In suburban and outer-city communities, white parents have a continuing relationship to the schools.

We suggest the school board and representative groups of parents negotiate a binding agreement creating a grievance procedure. The essence of such a procedure would be a progression of steps, each strictly limited in duration, specifying the appropriate administrative official and parent representative who are empowered to negotiate at each step. Teachers involved in the grievance should have the right to be present in person or through their union representative at each step. Parents or their representatives should have the same right. All parties should have the right to be accompanied by counsel at all steps. A public appeals board, with the power to recommend, should hear any appeal from the decision of the school board. The appeals board should be selected by the school board and representative groups of parents.

Any matter respecting the welfare and education of a school child would be proper subjects of negotiation. Grievances may be directed at a teacher, a principal, or other administrative officer of the school board, as well as the board itself. Grievances may also be initiated by teachers, principals, or other administrative officer of the board, as well as the board itself.

Under the provisions of the grievance procedure, a parent would be a legal resident of Chicago who is the natural parent or legal guardian of a child enrolled full-time in any school operated by the Chicago board of education. In any election of parent representatives, for example, no person should vote if he has no children, or none still in school, or if he lives outside Chicago, or his children are enrolled exclusively in non-public schools.

One basic purpose of this proposal is to lay the ground for orderly and prompt settlement of disputes in their earliest phase. Another is to encourage the school system to take parents into account while planning for their children. Long, drawn-out conflicts which have no decisive outcome are extremely destructive of morale in any school. Finally, as school systems move toward larger-scale organization, it is appropriate to adopt collective forms of parent-school relationship. The revival of the community school idea also bespeaks the wisdom of increasing parental involvement in school affairs. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine how a system of education parks, for example, could thrive in the absence of deep and meaningful involvement of the community.

SUMMARY

1. **Introduction** A modern desegregation plan must rid the schools of racial barriers. In addition, it must point toward reorganization within the classroom as well as provide for a more active role for parents. In the present report, a number of specific changes are put forward. All can be placed in effect, more or less, within a two-year period.

2. **Equitable Use of School Space** Empty classroom seats should be made available to children in overcrowded schools. Transfers should be permitted in the direction of desegregation. Utilization of available space should be based on mandatory assignment of children, at the expense of the school board. Such an approach alone could quickly desegregate at least 17 percent of the city's all-white elementary schools; 11 percent of the white branch schools; and 1 percent and 6 percent, respectively, of the Negro schools and branches.

3. **Redistricting** Redistricting could promptly desegregate as many as one-fourth of the all-white or all-Negro schools. Prevention of future segregation could be achieved by reversing specific decisions on sites for a new crowded Forrestville and an addition to a 75-year old high school building.

4. **Pairing** Some 50 schools -- or 10% of the 440 elementary schools and their branches -- could be arranged into 25 pairs of Negro and white schools. These pairings would affect especially Negro-segregated schools bordered by white schools. Mobiles could be used to aid the effort. In New York, pairings have been successful in desegregating and at the same time increasing the academic achievement of deprived

children without injury to the more advantaged children.

5. **Vocational High Schools** **Three clearly inadequate vocational high schools, virtually all-Negro, should be closed down and their students reassigned to general high schools. Two of the remaining vocational high schools -- racially-opposite Prosser and Dunbar -- should be converted into trade schools. The school board should apply for a federal grant to set up a residential vocational education school.**

6. **Washburne** **The Washburne apprentice program should be made non-discriminatory or closed down in accordance with the school board's formal non-discriminatory program. If it is closed, the building should be converted into the city's first residential vocational education school.**

7. **Integrating the Bi-Racial School** **The 89 integrated schools enrolling 86,000 Negro and white students should be organized into an administrative area and serve as a demonstration project for the entire school system. A concerted effort should be made to transform these formally integrated schools into living examples of genuine integration and quality education. An area-wide parents council would help guide the work of the area's schools.**

8. **The Pivotal Role of the Principal** **Experienced principals should be assigned to the most difficult schools. This will supply educational leadership where it is most lacking. Teachers will be encouraged to remain in such schools or even be attracted to such schools.**

9. The Faculty The prime problem of teacher-supply is to attain a proportionate distribution of regularly assigned tenured teachers. Principals, upon reassignment according to educational need, should be required to recruit whatever number of tenured teachers is due their school. Should this fail, teachers must be assigned according to need. Negro principals should be assigned to white schools; this would increase the willingness of Negro teachers to transfer to white schools.

10. Improving Instruction Now Numerous instructional changes can be put into effect almost immediately.

With funds available from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, class size at the 100 most severely deprived schools -- enrolling some 85,000 students -- should be cut in half. Teacher aides should be employed on a sweeping scale. A number of other changes can be made, involving cooperative planning of programs by widely-separated schools.

11. Parents and Governance of the Schools Parents faced with schools that fail persistently to educate their children have a right to a degree of direct control over the school system. The state should take direct responsibility for enforcing minimum standards of education. A formal grievance procedure for parents should be instituted, to be effective for disputes over any matter respecting the welfare and education of a parent's school child.

12. In-Service Re-Education In-Service re-education -- rather than the narrower concept of training -- must come to grips with the realities of racism in education. Self-critical discussion must be encouraged

up and down the levels of the school system. Out of such re-examination will come a dedication to the educability of all children.

APPENDIX A

PAIRING

In Greenburgh District 8, near White Plains, New York, pairing has gone on for several years. An evaluation of academic achievement from 1960-1961 to 1963-1964 shows that both Negro and white children are gaining; while Negro children are gaining more slowly, the achievement gap between the Negro and white children is being narrowed.[1] In Coatesville, Pennsylvania, a pairing plan was started during 1962. Since then, one evaluation observes, "the Negro children seem to be less far behind [in reading] than before".[2] The precise reasons for the tendency, however, seemed obscure to the evaluator.

The positive effects of pairing on academic achievement can be attributed to the often-documented stimulative impetus afforded by racial cooperation and to special measures to improve classroom instruction. The question can be asked: Would not the special measures alone have produced the academic achievement, even in a setting of racial isolation?[3]

A practical test -- virtually unique -- is available in the setting of New York City. There, two special compensatory programs have operated at the same time -- pairing (Community Zoned Schools) and the More Effective Schools program. Both have somewhat comparable advantages as contrasted with other elementary schools.[4]

Type of School	Average Class Size		Pupil-Teacher Ratio	
	1963	1966	1963	1966
More Effective Schools	28.3	20.1	25.0	12.3
Community Zoned Schools	28.8	21.4	25.1	16.1
Special Service Schools	27.9	29.2	24.2	20.9
Citywide Elementary Schools	29.5	27.7	26.1	21.9

The two groups of schools differed greatly in ethnic composition. In October, 1965, for example, Puerto Ricans and Negroes constituted from 32.5% to 81.6% of the register of the eight-paired schools.[5] None, in other words, fell into the common definition of segregated. In the twenty-one More Effective Schools, on the other hand, Puerto Ricans and Negroes constituted from 30.9% to 100% of the register. Twelve of the 21 schools were segregated -- i.e., had less than 10% "other".[6]

An evaluation of academic achievement in both programs showed distinctly superior achievement in the paired schools as compared with More Effective Schools. In the paired schools, as we saw above, students as a group gained in academic achievement in relation to national norms. White children continued to score higher and gain more than Negro children. A number of Negro children, especially those who travelled to a paired school, narrowed the achievement gap between Negro and white children.[7] In an evaluation of the MES program, the evaluator concluded: "...Three full years of MES did not have any effect in stopping the increasing retardation of children who began the program in grades two or three, but did have some initial effect, albeit not maintained, on the retardation of the children who began the program in grade four".[8]

Can the difference be accounted for by differential per student expenditure? In 1965-1966, per pupil costs of instruction in MES ranged from $859 to $931.[9] An average for the eight-paired schools was $594.[10] Clearly, the higher-achieving schools were spending less per student than the lower-achieving schools.

Perhaps children from preponderantly higher socio-economic groups attended the paired schools. A listing of the criteria for selecting paired schools contains items such as distance and the like; the only social distinction specified is ethnic composition.[11] It is not, however, out of the question -- though it is unlikely -- that greater achievement in the paired schools can be accounted for by socio-economic factors rather than by racial interaction. Such evidence is presently unavailable. Sixteen of the 21 MES schools are located in poverty areas as defined for purposes of Title I, ESEA.[12]

In the absence of contrary indications, therefore, it seems warranted to conclude that the clear achievement superiority of the paired schools over MES schools lies with the racial interaction in the former and racial isolation in the latter. If this is true, then racial integration through pairing (and other techniques) is a workable and practical means of providing improved educational opportunities to deprived Negro and Puerto Rican children.

APPENDIX A - FOOTNOTES

1. See George E. Fitch, A Report and Recommendations on Achievement Test Results 1964 (Hartsdale, N.Y.: Greenburgh District 8, 1964), pp. 28, 32-33. A less favorable picture of the Greenburgh pairing experience is in Robert Stout and Morton Inger, School Desegregation: Progress in Eight Cities (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, October, 1966), unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, p. 11-45. The latter study, however, deals only with reading achievement. The Fitch study is based on achievement scores on the entire test battery (Metropolitan Achievement Tests: reading, arithmetic, spelling, and language). Fitch is interested in relative progress between Negro and white, while Stout and Inger center on Negro and white grade placement. See, however, the more favorable evaluation of Project Able Program by Stout and Inger, pp. 11-46-47.

2. Stout and Inger, School Desegregation, p. 4-22.

3. See U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967), I, Chapter 4.

4. Leonard Moriber, "Statistics Describing Selected Aspects of the Program", in David J. Fox, Expansion of the More Effective Schools Program (N.Y.: Center for Urban Education, September, 1967), p. A2.

5. Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program, p. 7.

6. Moriber, in Fox, p. A7.

7. See Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program, p. 35.

8. Fox, Expansion, p. 63.

9. Ibid., p. A-11.

10. Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program, p. 17.

11. Jacob Landers, Improving Ethnic Distribution of New York City Pupils (N.Y.: Board of Education, May, 1966), p. 30.

12. Bernard E. Donovan, Summary of Proposed Programs 1967-68, Title I -- Elementary and Secondary Education Act (N.Y.: Board of Education, August 30, 1967), p. 26.

APPENDIX B

SUGGESTIONS FOR TRANSITIONAL CHANGES IN THE SCHOOL SYSTEM[1]

1. Convert the neighborhood school into a community school.

   (a) Keep doors open 8 a.m.-4 p.m.; for teacher work on curriculum and preparation of individualized materials; small-group experimentation; in-service meetings.

   (b) Open Saturday to work on large-scale projects (painting a mural, putting on a play, editing a magazine, etc.)

2. "Alliances" of several schools serving a common function would be formed

   (a) e.g., schools with Saturday programs

   (b) alliances would be organized and led by committee of principals

3. Form an alliance to develop "supplemental centers" with each unit specializing in a program (science, independent study, etc.)

   (a) Cover basic curriculum at home school, a.m.;

   (b) Spend afternoons, for 4-6 weeks, at specializing school

4. Create three experimental schools in three parts of city.

   (a) Integrated staff and student body

   (b) Would teach a common curriculum but also specialize in a teaching function

   (c) Three functions:

      (1) center for curriculum study and experimentation
      (2) center for teacher training
      (3) center for teaching techniques, including audio-visual and other mechanical aids

   (d) Faculty divided into permanent staff and visiting staff

   (3) Would feed ideas into all schools through visiting staff and other communication.

5. School clusters

   (a) Especially where possible to site a new school midway between two older schools so as to maximize integration

   (b) Staff each school in the cluster according to its needs, not according to formula

(c) Each school offers general studies

(d) Each school concentrates

  (1) math and science
  (2) language arts
  (3) shop and vocational programs

(e) Use computers to allocate students in flexible programs

(f) Assign teacher to the cluster, not the school.

  (1) Teacher-teams travel from school to school
  (2) practicing artist at one school while art teachers visit other schools in cluster

(g) Share central athletic facilities

  (1) Greatly expanded inter-mural program because of shared facilities and staff

6. Vocational education

(a) Vocational schools should be conceived as supplementary rather than parallel to general high schools.

(b) With computer, possible to work out extensive and flexible variety of programming of students who would go to vocational school for portion of day.

(c) Each vocational school should specialize in one area, thus making it possible for that school to "keep up" technologically, utilize experts on part-time basis.

(d) Achievement of "C" would facilitate development of more effective work-study programs.

7. Allocation of funds

(a) Drop city-wide formula for assigning personnel and funds

(b) Different types of schools have different needs

8. Urban-urban exchanges

(a) Small-scale groups investigate matters of common interests

(b) Examples:

  (1) children and parents from Negro and white areas explore city for a day
  (2) student society plan luncheons
  (3) language classes have a luncheon and no English spoken until dessert
  (4) seminars (esp. on high school level)

APPENDIX B - FOOTNOTES

1. Katz, "Tentative Proposals for Achieving Quality, Integrated Education in Urban School Systems", pp. 4-15. These suggestions were prepared for the present report.

APPENDIX C

AN APPROACH TO IN-SERVICE RE-EDUCATION*

1. School integration must be talked about in terms of the hearts and minds of educators -- teachers and administrators -- if there is to be progress which reaches into the hearts and minds of the children. As things stand today, the state of the hearts and minds of professional personnel represents a tremendous inertia and resistance that doom all efforts at progress to no more than mechanical and superficial aspects of the problem.

2. The validity of these assertions is shown by the fact that few teachers have a developed way of thinking about the racial issue in education -- the great majority do not even have a method of talking about it beyond primitive cliches -- and it is rare to find teachers (or administrators) struggling for integration in ways that demonstrate comprehensive understanding and deep conviction.

3. The broad strategy on behalf of integration has taken a form typical of other attempts to change education -- it has ignored the teachers and pressed for solutions on other dimensions of the problem. These "solutions" are, however, illusory insofar as authentic changes are sought, for teachers hold the keys to progress in education. What counts in the classrooms and throughout the schools is the human meaning of the behavior of the professional personnel in interaction with children. As long as the hearts and minds of teachers and administrators are locked into the existing system of racist education, the human meanings conveyed to children will be those of racism.

4. If, instead, they grasped in educational terms the profound sickness that segregated education represents and gained a vision of integrated education that could guide and motivate them, tremendous creative forces would be liberated within the school system. Action on problems that made little sense to teachers when viewed in isolated fashion would represent important steps in achieving the overall goals of eliminating racism and attaining integration. Initiative and ingenuity would overcome obstacles whose content often was as much apathy, lack of understanding, and internal prejudice among professional people as it was the ostensible nature of the problem. Salient problems would be attacked which hitherto were far beyond what was considered practicable aims of an integration program.

5. Thus, a fundamental and necessary condition of integration is that teachers gain a comprehensive understanding of racism in education; that they see school integration as a central cause of education; and that they recognize that the attainment of integration lies in what they do. But what do most teachers presently have in mind when they think of the racial question in education?

-- It is a civil rights problem, not an educational problem.

-- It is a Negro problem, not a white problem.

-- It is imposed on schools by external pressures which interfere with the normal routines of education.

-- Those teachers friendly to civil rights see it and accept it as an issue of "democratic education" but often fail to see any deeper connections to the processes and aims of education.

-- It is an issue predominantly of the physical separation of the races.

-- Since in the larger cities there appears to be a limit as to what can be done about physical separation, it is hopeless to try to do much about integration.

-- It is not worth busing children around to obtain integrated schools.

-- Nothing much can be done until there is housing integration.

-- Negro children and teachers would, in any case, rather go to schools with their "own kind" (and, recently, the Black Power movement gives opportune confirmation to those who prefer to think this way).

-- Educators should follow their long professional tradition by continuing to be "color blind" and to retain an impartial and neutral stance.

-- In a democracy, education should follow the wishes of the community. Therefore, teachers should not try to create change until the community has indicated its desires and transmitted them through the school board.

-- Integration has not worked where it has been tried -- specific schools in the city can be cited.

6. What are the ingredients for a framework in which teachers can think effectively about the question of racism in education? The following key elements are suggested as belonging in such a framework:

   a. The following are basic questions which need to be posed:

      (1) Is racism an external or marginal issue, or is it centrally involved with the aims and process of education and the roles and responsibilities of professional personnel?

(2) What is the nature of racism in education? How did it come to be incorporated into education and in what ways is it manifested in educational processes? Is this primarily a Negro problem and, if not, how are whites involved?

(3) In strictly educational terms, what are the consequences of racism? How do we evaluate these consequences?

(4) What are the direct and indirect involvements of professional personnel in segregated educational processes? What has it meant for teachers? What has been the traditional stance on the issue?

(5) What do we mean by integrated education?

(6) What are the actual alternatives which confront teachers respecting segregation and integration in education?

(7) What are the rationals, objectives, key elements, and dynamics of a program to bring about integration and what are the key resistances?

(8) What are the roles and responsibilities of professional people in the initiation and implementation of such a program?

b. Basic starting point: School as an institution in our society

(1) If the city is racist, then the school system also will be (unless it has a record of fighting segregation internally and no such record exists for any city.)

(2) Racism is patterned behavior including physical separation but not limited to that and is based on premise of inferiority. Pattern is duplicated in schools -- i.e., it is deeply incorporated in multiple aspects of educational process and reflects at every point assumption of inferiority.

(3) Physical separation is most obvious but by far not the sole element in this pattern.

(4) Since most people cannot deny existence of a racist pattern in society, they are forced to admit it must exist in schools and that schools help perpetuate the overall system. This can be demonstrated in every aspect of school structure and operation.

c. Consequence in terms of educational outcomes:

(1) De facto segregated school system -- i.e., one whose structure and processes exemplify racism -- teaches racism. Schools perpetuate the lie of difference and inferiority.

(2) Education of Negro children is grossly inferior, and in many ways they are actually harmed by exposure to school.

(3) Education of white children is also degraded through the destructive effects of the dual system on the whole (in addition to educational effect of learning racism.)

(4) Teachers and their organizations are corrupted and disunified by their deep involvement in segregated educational processes.

(5) Overall conclusion: A school system incorporating the premises, patterns, and practices of racism operates against education -- at least, against any authentic view of education.

d. The position of teachers in the segregated system:

(1) Teachers -- consciously or unconsciously, willingly or unwillingly -- necessarily collaborate in the workings of the system.

(2) In particular, crucial aspects of the racist educational process are incorporated in the personalities of a major section of the teaching force and are expressed in understandings, attitudes, expectations, and behavior which fit in and are vital parts of the overall system.

(3) There is no neutrality -- teachers either collaborate with or try to fight against segregated education. In short, to be for education is to be for integrated education.

e. What is integration?

(1) Clearly, it requires the elimination of racism from every aspect of education.

(2) On the positive side, there may be various ways of looking at the question -- one way is that the ultimate aim is the development of normal relationships among all children (and thus a variety of means must be developed to help attain this goal).

(3) Compensatory programs, for both white and Negro children, are necessary to attainment of goal of integration.

f. What is an integration program?

(1) Professional people take responsibility and give leadership.

(2) The program attacks all aspects of integration.

(3) The program is not limited to Negroes or Negro areas -- in fact, one strength of this framework is that it demonstrates that racism in education is a phenomenon of white society, incorporated in white-dominated institutions (Negroes are simply the chief victims).

(4) The program is not stymied because of the difficulties in obtaining racial balance in cities with vast ghettos:

(a) The overall pattern is the target -- thus many things need to be done while headway is also being made on the racial balance problems. (The definition of the word "integration" will now include a great deal more than simply racial balance.)

(b) Educators who see the educational benefits of inter-racial classrooms will apply much greater ingenuity and determination to achieving such classrooms.

(5) Integration in education becomes a movement with great educational meaning and purpose, one which can enlist teachers and officials in a unique, history-making experience, a movement with definite and feasible goals that will bring education out of the trap it is in and will also contribute greatly to bringing use out of the trap that our entire society is in.

7. The effects of a growing core of teachers and officials incorporating and utilizing a framework such as this (or a better one):

a. They will be increasingly able to set the terms of discussion of and approach to the question of racism in education.

b. They will increasingly be able to get others -- fellow educators, the community, students -- to absorb and think in terms of the framework.

c. They will increasingly be able to exert programmatic leadership parallel to their intellectual and attitudinal leadership.

8. Question: How to Create an Effective Confrontation and Dialogue Among Teachers?

a. The fact that this is a problem is an index of the backward condition of education. The general sterility of discussion among teachers, like racism in education, is part of the overall sickness of education. It is important to note this -- namely, that whatever is accomplished towards stimulating the dialogue on racism (and whatever is accomplished respecting racism) is not only a means to end racism in education but a large-scale attack on basic ills of education.

b. Teachers, strangely enough, do not seem to have the attributes of a public (as per Walter Lippmann) -- a group in which relevant issues are defined out in discussion, in which alternative viewpoints are developed, and in which continuing debate the members can grasp the various alternatives and come to some conclusions. A genuine discussion, one in which teachers actually come to grips with the intellectual and emotional issues that are involved, means thus a good deal more than what is usually done in an in-service human relations program. A genuine discussion means a real clash of thought and feeling, it means an openness that allows even racist feelings that many teachers have to come to the surface; it means a debate raging through the school system from bottom to top.

c. Strategy for promoting confrontation and dialogue

Get debate going -- Through support of school administration, through support of teacher organizations, through help of universities, and through specialized means, start discussions which are of, by, and for teachers and school officials.

(1) Structure discussions so that different viewpoints are represented.

(2) Build discussions around basic and provocative questions which get to the guts of the issues.

(3) Have moderators with skills of helping to define out the various viewpoints and the issues -- so that there is the help of clarification and of the guidance of the discussion towards greater relevance to the emerging issues -- while at same time being able to maintain the respect and confidence of the various contenders.

(4) While outside resources may be utilized, the main protagonists should be teachers, principals, and other officials in the school system -- but primarily teachers. The aim should be to create engagement at all levels by the involvement of representative individuals in open dialogues which have the support of the educational community and which lend prestige to the participants.

(5) Thus the aims would be to generate discussion within the schools, districts, functional groups, organizations, informal situations everywhere, etc.

(6) Community discussions involving teachers (of various viewpoints) would also help generate the sense of a significant and exciting discussion.

(7) Written materials -- Particular discussions should be reproduced and distributed to those who could not attend. Individuals or groups with particular viewpoints they wish

to articulate should have the chance to have them reproduced and distributed. The skilled moderators (noted above) should be employed to help this process as well as the processes of verbal discussion.

(8) All types of media and settings should be used -- internal school facilities, radio and TV, newspapers, all types of meeting places, teacher organizational facilities, etc. The main guideline would be to maintain the spirit of free debate and to keep the discussion moving along.

(9) The support of school officials for the debate would be of great value. The superintendent should make clear by word and behavior that he is supporting free dialogue. He is free, like anyone else, to enter the lists, but in terms of presenting a point of view and not of dictating conclusions.

(10) There is room for ingenuity here, and perhaps colleges and universities may supply some in the effort to get large numbers of teachers personally caught up in a continuing participation.

(11) Role of the Office of Education -- Both a spearhead and spadework are needed, as well as material support. Can the Office of Education supply these? If it is true that the hearts and minds of the professional staff represent a primary obstacle to integrated education, is not a major attack on this obstacle a fundamental criterion for any genuine program of integration? Cannot a program be devised which will enlist school administrations and teacher organizations in an authentic effort to confront the issue of the educator's role and responsibility in school integration?

9. What is the Likely Outcome of Genuine Confrontation and Dialogue In a School System?

a. The stronger frame of reference will take hold among an increasing core of teachers -- The frame of reference described above is much more powerful in terms of its values, logic, support in reality, goals, and rewards than anything the adherents of the status quo will be able to produce.

b. As the dialogue proceeds, the alternatives will tend to crystallize. The moral advantage, as well as the advantage in fact and logic, will increasingly shift to the advocates of a comprehensive program of integration. Individual actions will start -- such as the faculty of an all-white school waking up to the fact that an all-white faculty is bad education and starting actively to recruit Negro teachers. Or, establishing relationships and interchanging in various ways with an all-Negro school. Or, deciding that it must cease teaching a racist American history and to that end beginning to learn and teach the new history.

c. On a system-wide level, programs will evolve out of the discussion and be brought forth by teachers, teacher groups, officials, community people, and college participants -- programs which call for a comprehensive, persistent and large-scale undertaking to once-and-for-all eliminate racism from the schools of the city.

d. Such programs will have much better chance of coming to light, being adopted, and succeeding (though still with much pain, ferment, and time) out of the proposed confrontation and dialogue than by any other method that has been suggested.

FOOTNOTES

1. See "Parting Word" of Judge J. Skelly Wright in Hobson v. Hansen, June 19, 1967; reprinted in Integrated Education, August-September, 1967, p. 52.

2. See M. Weinberg, Research on School Desegregation (Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1965), pp. 1-2, 10.

3. Rich, "The Relations of Unsegregated, Desegregated, and Transition Schools to Racially Mixed Student Bodies", October, 1967, p. 8.

4. James F. Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, p. B-7. On August 23, 1967, the school board adopted the entire Redmond report "in principle".

5. Edwin C. Berry, Chicago Tribune, August 3, 1963. (Mr. Berry is Executive Director of the Chicago Urban League.)

6. Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools, Report, p. 68.

7. "Report on U.S. Office of Education Analysis of Chicago Public Schools", Integrated Education, December 1966-January 1967, p. 19.

8. No schools were specified. Coons in Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, pp. B-21-22.

9. Advisory Panel on Integration of the Public Schools, Report, p. 63.

10. Coons in Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, p. B-22.

11. Katz, "Tentative Proposals", p. 15.

12. Coons in Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, p. B-29.

13. A very general report on Kentucky is John Fleming, Kentucky School Pairing Plans (Frankfort, Ky.: Kentucky Commission on Human Rights, May, 1967).

14. Evaluation of the Community Zoning Program. Summary Reports (N.Y.: Board of Education, September, 1966), p. 60.

15. Ibid., p. 63. Outside consultants who advised in the experimental design and interpretation of results included Anne Anastasi, Dan Dodson, Edmund W. Gordon, Sam Sieber, and Robert L. Thorndike.

16. Coons in Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, p. B-22.

17. Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, p. C-24.

18. Robert J. Havighurst, The Public Schools of Chicago: A Survey (Chicago: Board of Education, 1964) p. 261. Westcott has since been replaced by Simeon. On p. 257, the author describes Cooley, Cregier, and Westcott as "grossly insufficient".

19. John Coons, Report to the U.S. Office of Education on the Public Schools of Chicago, Draft copy, June 20, 1965, p. II-19.

20. Ibid, p. V-11.

21. See map in Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, following p. C-34.

22. See Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, p. C-26.

23. See Marjorie Lord Dunnegan, "Vocational Education at Dunbar", Integrated Education, June, 1963. "At the end of many a school year Dunbar Trade School could boast of a 90% placement record for its graduates". (The author is the mother of a Dunbar graduate.)

24. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Administration of Vocational Education. Rules and Regulations, eighth edition (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 58. See also, p. 73, on available appropriations.

25. See Roman C. Pucinski, "Cooling the Summer Riots With Vocational Education", Illinois Education, October, 1967, pp. 72-74.

26. Philip M. Katz, "Tentative Proposals for Achieving Quality, Integrated Education in Urban School Systems", October, 1967, p. 13.

27. "Report on U.S. Office of Education Analysis", p. 18.

28. Havighurst, The Public Schools of Chicago, p. 258.

29. "Report on U.S. Office of Education Analysis", p. 16-18.

30. Faith Rich, "The Relation of Unsegregated, Desegregated, and Transition Schools to Racially Mixed Student Bodies", October, 1967, p. 4. The 86,000 students comprised some 15% of total enrollment.

31. Thoreau to H. G. O. Blake, March 27, 1848, The Correspondence of Henry David Thoreau, ed. Walter Harding and Carl Bode (N.Y.: New York University Press, 1958), p. 216.

32. Raymond L. Jerrems and Frances S. Burrill, A Study of the Promotion System for Principals of the Chicago Public Schools from 1955 to 1965, 1967, p. 49. (Both authors are principals in Chicago public schools.

33. This viewpoint is adopted also in Redmond, Increasing Desegregation, p. A-4.

34. "Report on U.S. Office of Education Analysis", p. 21.

35. See Jerrems and Burrill, A Study of the Promotion System,

36. Albert A. Raby to Francis Keppel, U.S. Office of Education, December 9, 1965. This document asked the Office of Education to invoke Sec. 210 of ESEA against the State of Illinois.

37. On September 13, 1967, the board of education approved a contract with the Educational Testing Service to conduct an evaluation of the 1966-67 Title I program; Report 67-931-3.

38. Sources of information include Dr. Frank Riessman, now Director, New Career Development Center, New York University, 22 Waverly Place, New York, N.Y. 100003; New Partners in the Educational Enterprise, Bank Street College of Education, 103 East 125th Street, New York, N.Y.: also Teacher Aides in Large School Systems (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1967. The Metropolitan YMCA in Chicago is studying the matter of subprofessionals in public service fields.